REMARKS

Claims 1-16 remain in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Corrections to the drawings, shown in "red," are enclosed for approval by the Examiner. It is respectfully requested that the submission of corrected formal drawings be delayed until such time as the application is deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1-4, 8-12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Di Santo et al. (U.S. 4,870,677).

Applicant has reviewed DiSanto and believes there are material differences in the structures claimed by Applicant and the subject matter shown in DiSanto.

DiSanto shows a telephone apparatus having a display on which characters and symbols may be displayed. According to DiSanto the display is an electrophoretic display. The particular type of electrophoretic display, DiSanto states, is described in US Patent No. 4,655,897, also to DiSanto. Overlaying the display is a pressure or position sensitive device which enables the user press on the overlay, and have the position of the contact be detected.

The display is described in both DiSanto patents as having a plurality of vertical conductive lines to form a grid in the Y direction on one side of a transparent member, and plurality of horizontal lines forming a grid in the X direction on an opposing side of the transparent member. An insulator layer separates the X and Y grids. Spaced above these grids is a conductive plate and between the plate and the grid is an electrophoretic dispersion containing chargeable particles which are located in wells or depressions between the X-Y pattern. All of which is described in DiSanto '677 at col. 1, lines 47-58, and more completely in DiSanto '897. To create images, characters or symbols, various combinations of X and Y lines must be electrified differently than the conductive plate to cause migration of the pigment particles.

Applicant believes the driver layer claimed by Applicant is substantially distinguishable from the X-Y grid taught by DiSanto. The X-Y grid used by DiSanto requires three conducting layers, the X layer, the Y layer, and the conducting plate. Applicant's driver layer allows Applicant to use only two conducting layers, the driver layer and the transparent conductor layer. Clearly, this is different than DiSanto. DiSanto requires the X and Y layers to be selectively electrified in various combinations to create symbols and characters from what would effectively be a matrix of pixels formed by the X-Y grid formed on opposite sides of an insulating member. The benefit of Applicant's arrangement is that an entire set of characters can be energized, and thus displayed, with one or two lines. This is described in reference to FIG. 2 beginning on page 5, at line 30 to page 6, line 27. As described there, and entire set of conductor elements can be electrically energized with one set of traces, which would be electrically tied together.

With regard to dependent claims 2 and 7, and independent claim 16, there is claimed therein the limitation of two sets of conductor elements that coincidently located. These elements are not shown in DiSanto because DiSanto relies on a matrix approach to generate images. Examiner points the images generated by DiSanto as being coincidentally located, but these are the result of selectively energizing matrix elements alternatively. Applicant's conductor elements corresponding the symbols are in the shape of the symbols, as shown in FIG. 2.

With regard to dependent claims 3 and 10, Applicant claims a third set of conductor elements that are common to the first and second symbols to be displayed at that location. Examiner cites DiSanto's X grid. This is incorrect because the both the X and Y grids are required to form images in DiSanto.

With regard to claims 4 and 11, Applicant claims the limitation that the symbols are not commonly oriented, as shown in FIG. 2, where the "I" and "1" symbols are to be read form different orientations. In DiSanto all symbols are read form the same orientation, as shown in FIGs 2 & 3 of DiSanto '677.

With regard to claim 12, Examiner contends that DiSanto shows the claimed limitation of a first and second symbol sets created by first and second sets of conductor elements. Examiner analogizes the X-Y lines of DiSanto to the symbol-shaped conductor elements claimed by Applicant. Clearly, DiSanto shows no such configuration.

In general, it appears Examiner is equating conductive runners of DiSanto's X-Y grids with Applicant's conductor elements. This is incorrect because Applicant also describes traces (elements 212, 214, 216, 218, 220, for example) which are similar to the X-Y traces used by DiSanto. However, Appplicant's conductor elements (such as elements 202, 204, 206, 208, 210, for example) are in the shape of the symbols that will be displayed. Clearly, DiSanto shows no such conductor elements.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 5-7 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Di Santo et al. (U.S. 4,870,677) in view of Dreher (U.S. 4,551,717).

The arguments made above with regard to DiSanto apply equally with regard to the combination of DiSanto and Dreher. As such, and considering these claims depend from claims considered to be allowable by Applicant, Applicant believes these claims are likewise allowable.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Scott M. Garrett
Agent of Record
Reg. No.: 39,988
Telephone: 954-723-6449
Fax No.: 954-723-5599
Email: Scott.garrett@motorola.com

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 24273